REMARKS

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sasuga et al. (US 5,897,188), claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasuga et al. in view of Hwang (US 6,478,622), claims 4-6 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasuga et al. in view of Hashimoto (US 5,946,195), and claim 8 stands rejected under § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Sasuga et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon combinations of references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in independent claims 1 and 8, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14.

The Office Action alleges that <u>Sasuga et al.</u> discloses "a hole in the printed circuit board (FGP) and a projected part (FG, col. 19, lines 38-40) protruding from the supporter main (SHD)" and that "Sasuga discloses that the projected part (FG) is inserted into the hole (FGP) to that the casing (SHD) and the printed circuit board (PCB1) can be mechanically connected (col. 19, lines 42-45)." Moreover, the Office Action alleges that it would be obvious to adapt the constructive steps of <u>Sasuga et al.</u> for implementing the claimed device. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully assert that <u>Sasuga et al.</u> is completely silent with regard to a hole formed in the printed circuit board and a projected part protruding from the supporter main, wherein "the projected part is inserted into the hole to affix the printed circuit board to the supporter main," as recited by independent claims 1 and 8. For example, contrary to allegations made by the Office Action, <u>Sasuga et al.</u> discloses (col. 19, lines 38-45):

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5123

Application No.: 10/606,800

Page 3

"The frame grounds FG of the shield casing SHD are made of thin metal projections so that they can be easily connected with the frame ground pads FGP of the display panel PNL by folding them, thus requiring no special wire (or lead) for the connections. Moreover, the shield casing SHD and the drive circuit substrate PCB1 can also be mechanically connected through the frame grounds FG, to improve the mechanical strength of the drive circuit substrate PCB1."

According to the above passage of Sasuga et al., the frame grounds FG are connected to the frame ground pads FGP of the display panel PNL. However, Sasuga et al. has absolutely no teaching, either explicitly or implicitly in any of the drawings figures or the written disclosure, that the printed circuit board PCB1 includes a hole such that the frame grounds FG are inserted into a hole formed in the printed circuit board PCB1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Sasuga et al. fails to teach or suggest a projected part of a main supporter and a hole in a printed circuit board wherein "the projected part is inserted into the hole to affix the printed circuit board to the supporter main to affix the printed circuit board to the supporter main," as recited by independent claims 1 and 8, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that both <u>Hwang</u> and <u>Hashimoto</u> are both completely silent with respect to a liquid crystal display device including a projected part of a supporter frame being inserted into a hole in a printed circuit board. Accordingly, neither <u>Hwang</u> nor Hashimoto can remedy the deficiencies of Sasuga et al.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because <u>Sasuga et al.</u>, <u>Hwang</u>, and <u>Hashimoto</u>, whether taken individually or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1 and 8, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5123

Application No.: 10/606,800

Page 4

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely

allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding

after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned

representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge

the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also

be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:

David B. Hardy Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: March 4, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000